

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

1. Rejection of claims 1-4, 7-10, and 13 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e):

Claims 1-4, 7-10, and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Elliott et al. (US 6,442,328).

5

**Response:**

Claims 1, 7, and 13 have been amended to overcome these rejections. Each of these claims now recites that the claimed broadcasting apparatus is installed in a computer system and that the receiver receives signals transmitted from a computer network.

10

On the other hand, Elliott teaches in Figure 2 a set-top box 100 connected to a digital video recorder 200 and a display device 300. The set-top box 100 is used for receiving a broadcast signal 102, which can be transmitted to the digital video recorder 200. The set-top box 100 can output either the broadcast signal 102 or a recorded video signal 108 to the display device 300.

15

The claimed invention according to the currently amended claims 1, 7, and 13 differs from Elliott in at least the following ways. First, the set-top box 100 of Elliott is not installed in a computer system. Second, the video tuner 112 does not receive signals transmitted from a computer network, and instead receives a video broadcasting signal 102. Thus, Elliott does not teach all of the limitations of the currently amended claims 1, 7, and 13.

20

As to claims 2 and 8, Elliott teaches a multiplexer 150 in the set-top box 100 used for selecting either a real-time video signal 106 or a recorded video signal 108 that is provided to the display device 300. Therefore, Elliott does not teach that “the audio data stream controller is a mixer for mixing the audio signal and the broadcasting audio signal to generate the sound signal”, as recited in claim 2, or that “the video data stream controller is a mixer for mixing the video signal

25

30

and the broadcasting video signal to generate the graphic signal”, as recited in claim 8. Although a multiplexer and a mixer each have two inputs and a single output, it does not imply that the functions of a multiplexer and a mixer are the same. A multiplexer simply selects one of the inputs to be output, whereas a  
5 mixer will mix the two inputs before outputting the mixed result. In the case of the claimed invention, broadcast audio or video signals are respectively mixed together with other audio or video signals before being output. In this way, the user can be made aware of the broadcast signals without overly interfering with normal computer system activity. For these reasons, the applicant respectfully  
10 submits that claims 2 and 8 are patentable over the cited prior art.

Furthermore, claims 2-4 and 8-10 are respectively dependent on claims 1 and 7, and thus should be allowed if their respective base claims are allowed. Reconsideration of claims 1-4, 7-10, and 13 is therefore respectfully requested.

15  
2. Rejection of claims 1, 5, 7, 11, 13, and 14 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b):

Claims 1, 5, 7, 11, 13, and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Hylton et al. (US 5,613,191).

20 **Response:**

As stated above, claims 1, 7, and 13 have been amended to overcome these rejections. Each of these claims now recites that the claimed broadcasting apparatus is installed in a computer system and that the receiver receives signals transmitted from a computer network.

25 In contrast, Hylton teaches in Figure 9 a digital entertainment terminal 1218 for receiving video signals, and decoding the video signals into video and audio signals, and outputting the decoded video and audio signals. Hylton does not teach the following limitations contained in the currently amended claims 1, 7,  
30 and 13. Hylton does not teach that the digital entertainment terminal 1218 is

installed in a computer system. Also, Hylton does not teach a receiver for receiving signals transmitted from a computer network. For these reasons, Hylton does not teach all of the limitations of the currently amended claims 1, 7, and 13.

5           Furthermore, claims 5, 11, and 14 are respectively dependent on claims 1, 7, and 13, and should be allowed if their respective base claims are allowed. Reconsideration of claims 1, 5, 7, 11, 13, and 14 is therefore respectfully requested.

10       3. Rejection of claims 6, 12, and 15 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a):

          Claims 6, 12, and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Elliott et al. (US 6,442,328) in view of Beller et al. (US 5,802,449).

15       **Response:**

          Claims 6, 12, and 15 are respectively dependent on claims 1, 7, and 13, and should be allowed if their respective base claims are allowed. Reconsideration of claims 6, 12, and 15 is therefore respectfully requested.

20           In view of the claim amendments and the above arguments in favor of patentability, the applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Appl. No. 10/063,944  
Amdt. dated May 08, 2007  
Reply to Office action of February 09, 2007

Sincerely yours,



Date: 05/08/2007

Winston Hsu, Patent Agent No. 41,526

5 P.O. BOX 506, Merrifield, VA 22116, U.S.A.

Voice Mail: 302-729-1562

Facsimile: 806-498-6673

e-mail : winstonhsu@naipo.com

- 10 Note: Please leave a message in my voice mail if you need to talk to me. (The time in D.C. is 12 hours behind the Taiwan time, i.e. 9 AM in D.C. = 9 PM in Taiwan.)